

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 1-8 were pending and under consideration in the application.

In the Office Action of August 17, 2010 claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected.

With this amendment, no claims are amended.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-6 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Lambino* (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0184435) (“*Lambino*”) in view of *Curry* (U.S. Pat. No. 6,032,248) (“*Curry*”).

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Lambino* in view of *Aasheim* (U.S. Pat. No. 7,178,061) (“*Aasheim*”)

In relevant part, independent claims 1 and 8 recite an RCC that is configured to read, when the first respective data block is determined as faulty, second data from a second respective data block and output the second data to the CPU when the second respective data block is determined as not faulty.

This is clearly unlike, *Lambino*. Instead, *Lambino* discloses a plurality of memory blocks that each include a mini-boot that validates the memory block from which the mini-boot is executing. See, U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0184435, Para. [0021]. *Lambino* also discloses that the mini-boot locates another valid memory block if the memory block the mini-boot is executing on is found invalid, and which changes a address select attribute to the valid memory address before resetting the system. See, *Id.* at Para. [0026]. This cannot be fairly viewed as disclosing a RCC that is configured to read, when the first respective data block is determined as faulty, second data from a second respective data block and output the second data to the CPU when the second respective data block is determined as not faulty because *Lambino* discloses a mini-boot

changing an address select attribute to a valid memory address upon a validation failure without disclosing the mini-boot reading from the valid memory location. Further, Lambino discloses a plurality of mini-boots without disclosing a RCC.

Aasheim and Curry both fail to disclose anything pertaining to reading from a second non faulty data block when a first data block is found to be faulty.

As the Applicant's specification discloses, by providing a RCC that is configured to read, when the first respective data block is determined as faulty, second data from a second respective data block and output the second data to the CPU when the second respective data block is determined as not faulty, the CPU can execute a boot program stably every time the boot program is requested.. See, U.S. Pat. No. 2008/0046637, Para. [0055].

Therefore, because Lambino, Curry or any possible combination of them fails to disclose or even fairly suggest every features of claims 1 and 8, the rejection of claims 1 and 8 cannot stand. Because claims 2-7 depend, either directly or indirectly from claims 1 and 8, they are allowable for at least the same reasons.

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1-8 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that, for any reason, direct contact with Applicants' attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below, for purposes of arranging for a telephonic interview. Any communication initiated by this paragraph should be deemed an Applicant-Initiated Interview.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SNR DENTON US LLP

By /David R. Metzger/
David R Metzger, Reg. No. 32,919
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Willis Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
312-876-8000 (telephone)
ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS